

REMARKS

Entry of the above noted amendments, reconsideration of the application, and allowance of all claims pending, specifically claims 1-9, 11-21, 23, and 25-30, are respectfully requested. These remarks regarding the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by the Applicants to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Claims 1-9, 11-21, 23, and 25-30 are pending.

INTERVIEW ON NOVEMBER 10, 2011

This reply follows a telephone conference held on November 8, 2011 between the Examiner and Applicants' attorney J. Steven Svoboda, in which features of Farzannejad (EP 1439725), Choi et al. (US Patent No. 7096020), and Bruno et al. (US Patent No. 6262978), proposed amendments, the specification, and the drawings were discussed. During the telephone conferences, Mr. Svoboda and the Examiner failed to reach agreement.

The time and courtesy afforded Applicants' attorney are gratefully acknowledged by the Applicants.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-19 and 22-23, 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farzannejad (EP 1439725; "Farzannejad") in view of Choi et al. (US Patent No. 7096020; "Choi"). Claims 6-7 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farzannejad in view of Choi and in further view of Bruno et al. (US Patent No. 6262978; "Bruno").

These rejections are respectfully but most strenuously, traversed. For explanatory purposes, the Applicants discuss herein one or more differences between the claimed invention and the Final Office Action's citations to Farzannejad, Choi, or Bruno. This discussion, however, is in no way meant to acquiesce in any characterization that one or more parts of the Final Office Action's citations to Farzannejad, Choi, or Bruno correspond to the claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Final Office Action's citations to Farzannejad, Choi, or Bruno, with or without modification or combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that the modification or combination of the Final Office Action's citations to the applied references is proper, do not teach or suggest "after the change of service is complete, transferring the call to the second subsystem," as recited in the Applicants' claims 1, 15, and 30.

While the Final Office Action (p. 5, section 4, last few lines on page; p. 10, 1st para., last lines of para.; and p. 15, 1st para., last lines of para.) reiterates the statements of the Office Action mailed May 6, 2011 (Office Action) that Farzannejad (Fig. 5, step 58) teaches or suggests "after the change of service is complete, transferring the call to the second subsystem," nothing in the cited sections of Farzannejad in fact teaches or suggests these limitations. In particular, Farzannejad does not teach transferring the call to the second subsystem *after* the change of service is complete.

Instead, the cited sections of Farzannejad (Fig. 5, step 58, and the associated text, i.e., col. 8, lines 19-25) teach that upon detection of a handover condition:

A second link is set up between the two phones via the fourth and fifth base stations 30 and [sic] 32 of the second network 28. Then the session is transferred to the second link where only voice can be transferred, step 58. Thereafter the session continues on the second link only using the voice with the video information being lost.

Farzannejad (col. 2, lines 19-21; col. 6, lines 20-23) teaches a system that is comprised of a first link of a first network having a high level of information content, and a second link of a second network having a lower level of information content. Farzannejad (col. 6, lines 53-355) further teaches that the second network 28 is a standard second-generation cellular network in the form of a GSM network. Accordingly, Farzannejad teaches setting up a second link on the *second* subsystem which supports the second service, then subsequently transferring the session. Therefore Farzannejad teaches away from the recitation in claims 1, 15, and 30, “*after* the change of service is complete, transferring the call to the second subsystem” [emphasis added]. Moreover, Farzannejad teaches away from a change of service occurring on the first subsystem, as recited in claims 1, 15, and 30. Indeed, in Farzannejad the change of service cannot occur on the first subsystem, because Farzannejad teaches away from setting up on the *first* subsystem a link supporting the second service.

The Applicants note that in the Responses to Arguments section of the Final Office Action (pp. 2-4), the Final Office Action does not include any additional citations to specific sections of Farzannejad, Choi, or Bruno. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully note that they are unable to provide further specific support for their position beyond the support already submitted in the previous reply to the Office Action. The Applicants respectfully request that in the event there are other sections of Farzannejad, Choi, or Bruno that the Examiner wishes to cite in support of his position, that the Examiner inform the Applicants of the portions of Farzannejad, Choi, or Bruno on which the Examiner is relying.

Finally, the Applicants note that the Final Office Action includes arguments that are claimed to rebut the Applicants' arguments regarding combination of references and motivation.

The Applicants respectfully note that the reply to the Office Action contained no arguments regarding combination of references or regarding motivation.

In short, none of the prior art cited by the Final Office Action teaches the limitation of transferring the call to the second subsystem after the change of service is complete.

Independent claims 1, 15, and 30 are believed neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record. The corresponding dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as independent claims 1, 15, and 30, as well as for their own additional characterizations.

Withdrawal of the §§ 103 rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven Svoboda/
J. Steven Svoboda
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,366

Dated: November 16, 2011

Carmen Patti Law Group, LLC
312-346-2800
Customer Number 47382